arXiv:1007.1477v2 [math.FA] 24 Nov 2010

Operators that achieve the norm

X. Carvajal[a,1], W. Neves[a,2]

[a] *Institute of Mathematics, Federal University of Rio de Janeiro, C.P. 68530, Cidade Universitária, 21945-970, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*

Abstract

In this paper we study the theory of operators on complex Hilbert spaces, which achieve the norm in the unit sphere. We prove important results concerning the characterization of the $\mathcal{AN}$ operators, see Definition 1.2. The class of $\mathcal{AN}$ operators contains the algebra of the compact ones.

Keywords: Hilbert spaces, bounded operators, spectral representation.

---

1. Introduction

The theory of invariant subspaces of operators remains nowadays an activity research area in functional analysis. It is still an open question whenever an arbitrary operator on an infinite Hilbert space has an invariant subspace, unless the trivial ones, that is to say the whole space and the zero one.

We shall be concentrated on this article on a class of bounded linear operators on complex Hilbert spaces, or on a subspace of it, which attains his norm on the unit sphere. Here by a subspace, we are always saying a closed subspace, and it is called invariant under an operator, when such an operator maps the subspace into itself.

In fact, the investigation of invariant subspaces for an operator is the first step to understand better the structure of the operator. For instance, the structure theorems on finite dimensional case, the Jordan Decomposition Theorem and the Spectral Theorem for normal operators illustrate, in particular, decompositions of the Hilbert space in invariant subspaces. Although, even for the finite dimensional set, the question of finding a complete set of invariant subspaces for any operator on a Hilbert space is arduous, unless for the self-adjoint

---

Email addresses: `carvajal@im.ufrj.br` (X. Carvajal), `wladimir@im.ufrj.br` (W. Neves)

[1] Partially supported by FAPERJ, Brazil, through the grant E-26/111.564/2008 entitled "*Analysis, Geometry and Applications*", by Pronex-FAPERJ through the grant E-26/110.560/2010 entitled "*Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*", and by the National Council of Technological and Scientific Development (CNPq), Brazil, by the grant 303849/2008-8.

[2] Partially supported by FAPERJ, Brazil, through the grant E-26/111.564/2008 entitled "*Analysis, Geometry and Applications*", and by Pronex-FAPERJ through the grant E-26/110.560/2010 entitled "*Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations*".

and the normal ones. In fact, the set of unitary invariants for a normal matrix is obtained by its spectrum, that is counting the multiplicities.

On the other hand, no general theory exists for a general operator in the infinite Hilbert space set. For the infinite dimensional case, the problem of how to count the spectral multiplicities for self-adjoint operators was first introduced by Hellinger [5]. Moreover, the question of counting the spectral multiplicities for normal operators on infinite Hilbert spaces could be studied in some different ways. For instance, in the context of C^*-algebras.

1.1. Purpose and some results

In this paper we describe some new results on bounded operators in Hilbert spaces, which achieve the norm. We study the operators that satisfy the $\mathcal{N}$ and $\mathcal{AN}$ properties, defined respectively in Definition 1.1 and Definition 1.2. This class of operators contains, for instance, the compact ones.

Let H, J be complex Hilbert spaces and $\mathcal{L}(H,J)$ the Banach space of linear bounded operators from H to J. We emphasize the case that will appear most frequently later, namely $\mathcal{L}(H,H)=\mathcal{L}(H)$. Further, we recall that, the space $\mathcal{L}(H,J)$ is a Banach space with the norm

$$\|T\| = \sup_{\|x\|_H \leq 1} \|Tx\|_J \tag{1.1}$$

and, it is well known that, if H has finite dimension, then the closed unit ball in H is compact (Heine-Borel Theorem) and the above "supreme" is a maximum. In other words, if the dimension H is finite and $T \in \mathcal{L}(H,J)$, then there exists an x in the closed unit ball in H (indeed in the boundary, i.e. the unit sphere), such that $\|T\| = \|Tx\|_J$. Although, in infinite dimension spaces this important property is lost, albeit it remains true for the compact operators. Indeed, by definition (1.1) there exists a sequence $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in the unit closed ball of H, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \|T\,x_n\|_J = \|T\|.$$

According to Banach-Alauglu Theorem, an element x exists in the unit closed ball, and a subsequence $(x_{n_k})_{k=1}^{\infty}$ of $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$, such that, x_{n_k} converges weakly to x. Therefore, since T is a compact operator

$$\|T\,x_{n_k}\|_J \to \|Tx\|_J.$$

It follows that, $\|T\| = \|Tx\|_J$. Hence any compact operator achieves the norm on the unit sphere. Then it is natural to propose the following question: How to characterize the operators which achieve the norm on the unit sphere? Trying to answer it, and also to study this interesting problem, we begin with the following

Definition 1.1. *An operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(H,J)$ is called to satisfy the property $\mathcal{N}$, when there exists an element x in the unit sphere, such that*

$$\|T\| = \|Tx\|_J.$$

On the other hand, the restriction of a compact operator to a subspace is a compact operator. Consequently, one can easily observe that if $(x_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a sequence in the intersection of the unit closed ball and a subspace M of H, and converges weakly, say $x_n \rightharpoonup x$, then $x \in M$, since M is closed. Therefore a compact operator satisfies the following generalization of the property $\mathcal{N}$. That is to say that a compact operator achieves absolutely the norm (Absolutely Norm). This suggests the following

Definition 1.2. *We say that $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator, or to satisfy the property $\mathcal{AN}$, when for all subspace $M \subset H$ ($M \neq \{0\}$), $T|_M$ satisfies the property $\mathcal{N}$.*

We recall that by a subspace, we always mean a closed subspace, hence on the definition quoted above M is always closed. Furthermore, it is quite normal to ask ourselves the following question: How to characterize the $\mathcal{AN}$ operators, i.e. the ones that achieve absolutely the norm on the unit sphere?

One address the work of Bernard Chevreau, see [1], who was the first, as it is the knowledge of the authors, to introduce some of these questions, when he was developing the canonical writing form of compact operators without the use of spectral properties, see [2].

1.2. Notation and background

At this point we fix the functional notation used in this paper, and recall some well known results from function analysis, see [3], [6].

By $(H, \langle ., . \rangle)$ we always denote a complex Hilbert space, S will denote the unit sphere in H and B the closed unit ball in H.

If $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$, the adjoint operator of T is denoted by $T^* \in \mathcal{L}(J, H)$, which satisfies $\|T^*\| = \|T\|$. An operator $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is called positive, when $\langle P\,x, x\rangle \geq 0$, for all $x \in H$. Given an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$, we denote by P_T, the unique operator called the positive square root of T^*T, that is, $\langle P_T\,x, x\rangle \geq 0$ for all $x \in H$ and $P_T^2 = T^*T$. Moreover, for $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ we recall the polar decomposition of T, that is $T = UP$, where U is a unitary operator ($U^* = U^{-1}$) and $P \geq 0$.

As usual, if $x, y \in H$, then $x \perp y$ means that x is orthogonal to y, i.e. $\langle x, y\rangle = 0$. Additionally, if $M \subset H$, we define

$$M^{\perp} := \{x \in H : \langle x, y\rangle = 0, \text{for all } y \in M\},$$

that is the orthogonal complement of M, which is a (closed) subspace of H. If M is a subspace of H, hence closed by assumption, then we could write $H = M \oplus M^{\perp}$. For $x \in H$, we denote by $\mathbb{C}\,x$ the one-dimensional subspace spanned by x, and by $x^{\perp}$ the orthogonal complement of it.

2. Property $\mathcal{N}$

Definition 2.1. *An operator $U \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ is called a partial isometry if there exists a closed subspace M of H, such that*

$$\forall x \in M, \ \ \|Ux\| = \|x\| \quad \textit{and} \quad \forall x \in M^{\perp}, \ Ux = 0.$$

Moreover, the orthogonal complement of the kernel of U is called the initial domain, and the range of U the final domain.

Remark 2.2. *Let U be a partial isometry with initial domain M and final domain M'. Then, we have:*

1. *UU^* is equal to the orthogonal projection on M, (denoted P_M).*
2. *U^* is a partial isometry with initial domain M'.*

It is clear from Definition 2.1, that if U is a partial isometry then U satisfies the property $\mathcal{N}$. Additionally, we observe that a linear combination of compact operators is also a compact operator and therefore satisfies $\mathcal{N}$. Although, the next example shows that this does not happen with the partial isometry. Therefore, the set of operators that achieve the norm does not form an algebra.

Example 2.3. *Let $\{e_j\}$ be an orthonormal base in l^2 and $a \in (0,1]$. Let (a_j), (b_j) be two sequences of real numbers, such that*

$$0 < a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a, \quad a_j \nearrow a, \quad a_j^2 + b_j^2 = 1.$$

Now, let T be the unitary operator given by $Te_j := \lambda_j\, e_j$, where $\lambda_j = a_j + ib_j$, $(j = 1, 2 \ldots)$. It is not difficult to see that $(T + I)$ does not satisfy $\mathcal{N}$. In fact, we have for each $x \in l^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|(T+I)x\|^2 &= \sum_j \left\{|\lambda_j|^2 + \lambda_j + \overline{\lambda_j} + 1\right\} |x_j|^2 = \sum_j 2(1+a_j)|x_j|^2 \\ &< \sum_j 2(1+a)|x_j|^2 = 2(1+a)\,\|x\|^2 .\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\|(T+I)\, e_j\| = \sqrt{2(1+a_j)}$, hence

$$\|(T+I)\| \geq \sup_j \|(T+I)\, e_j\| = \lim_{j\to\infty} \sqrt{2(1+a_j)} = \sqrt{2(1+a)}.$$

Consequently, we have for any $x \in S$ that

$$\|(T+I)\| = \sqrt{2(1+a)} \quad \text{and } \|(T+I)x\| < \|(T+I)\| .$$

Proposition 2.4. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a self-adjoint operator. Then, T satisfies $\mathcal{N}$ if, and only if $\|T\|$ or $-\|T\|$ is an eigenvalue of T.*

Proof. 1. The case when $\pm\|T\|$ is an eigenvalue of T is obvious. Indeed, if $x \in H$ is an eigenvector associated to $\pm\|T\|$, then $\|Tx_0\| = \|T\|$, where $x_0 := x/\|x\|$.

2. Now, assume that there exists an element $x_0 \in S$, such that $\|Tx_0\| = \|T\|$. Furthermore, without lost of generality, we can suppose that $\|T\| = 1$. We have

$$\langle (I - T^2)x_0, x_0\rangle = \|x_0\|^2 - \|Tx_0\|^2 = 0,$$

and since $(I - T^2) \geq 0$ is a positive operator, it follows that $(I - T^2)x_0 = 0$. Consequently, we must have

$$(I + T)(x_0 - Tx_0) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad (I - T)(x_0 + Tx_0) = 0.$$

Let us look at the former case, the second one is analogue. If $(x_0 - Tx_0) = 0$, then we are done, since $\|T\| = 1$ is an eigenvalue of T with the corresponded unitary eigenvector x_0. On the other hand, if $z = (x_0 - Tx_0) \neq 0$, let $z_0 := z/\|z\|$. It follows that, $Tz_0 = -z_0$, that is, z_0 is a unitary eigenvector associated to eigenvalue $-\|T\| = -1$.

According to the proposition quoted above if $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a positive operator and there exists an element $x_0 \in S$, such that $\|Px_0\| = \|P\|$, then

$$Px_0 = \|P\|x_0. \tag{2.2}$$

Likewise, since T satisfies $\mathcal{N}$ if, and only if P_T satisfies $\mathcal{N}$. Indeed,

$$\|T\| = \|P_T\| \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x \in H, \quad \|Tx\| = \|P_T x\|, \tag{2.3}$$

hence we have the following

Corollary 2.5. *An operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ satisfies $\mathcal{N}$ if, and only if $\|T\|$ is an eigenvalue of P_T.*

Hereupon, we demonstrate the relation of the $\mathcal{N}$ condition and the adjoint operator.

Proposition 2.6. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$, then T satisfies the condition $\mathcal{N}$ if, and only if the adjoint operator T^* satisfies $\mathcal{N}$.*

PROOF. Since we are considering the bounded case, we have $T^{**} = T$. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove one direction. Assume that T satisfies $\mathcal{N}$ condition. Then, $\|Tx_0\| = \|T\|$ with $x_0 \in S$. Now, set P_T the positive square root of T^*T. Hence by (2.2) and Corollary 2.5, $P_T x_0 = \|T\|x_0$, and thus $T^*Tx_0 = \|T\|^2 x_0$. Consequently, we have

$$\left\| T^* \left(T \frac{1}{\|T\|} x_0 \right) \right\| = \|T\|,$$

and $T\left(\frac{1}{\|T\|}x_0\right) \in S$, which means that T^* carries $\mathcal{N}$ out.

Proposition 2.7. *If $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ satisfies $\mathcal{N}$, that is, if there exists an element $x_0 \in S$, such that $\|Tx_0\| = \|T\|$, then*

$$T(x_0^\perp) \subset \big(Tx_0\big)^\perp. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. By (2.3), we have $\|P_T x_0\| = \|P_T\|$ and by (2.2), (2.3) and Corollary 2.5, we obtain $P_T\, x_0 = \|P_T\| x_0$. Therefore, if y is orthogonal to x_0, then

$$T^*Tx_0 = P_T^2\, x_0 = \|T\|^2 x_0$$

and y are orthogonal. Hence, Ty is orthogonal to Tx_0.

Remark 2.8. *If $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a positive operator and $x_0 \in S$ is such that, $\|Tx_0\| = \|T\|$, then $\mathbb{C}x_0$ reduces T.*

It is not clear that all positive operators carry $\mathcal{N}$ out, specially the self-adjoint ones. Then, we close this section with an example of a positive operator, which does not satisfy the $\mathcal{N}$ condition.

Example 2.9. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(l^2)$ be a positive operator, defined by*

$$T : l^2 \to l^2, \quad (x_j) \mapsto (\lambda_j x_j),$$

where $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \ldots < \lambda$, with $\lambda_j \nearrow \lambda$ and $\lambda < \infty$.

We have $T \geq 0$, $\|T\| = \lambda$, but for each $x \in l^2$ as $Tx \neq \lambda x$, we conclude that $\|T\|$ is not an eigenvalue. Consequently, by Proposition 2.4, T does not satisfy the $\mathcal{N}$ condition.

2.1. The numerical range relation

Definition 2.10. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. The numerical range of T is defined as*

$$W(T) := \{\langle Tx, x\rangle \in \mathbb{C};\ x \in S\}.$$

Remark 2.11. *Concerning the Toeplitz-Hausdorff's Theorem, $W(T)$ is a convex set.*

Now, if $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a self-adjoint operator, then by straightforward calculation $\|T\| = \sup_{x\in S} |\langle Tx, x\rangle|$. Therefore, for $P \geq 0$, it follows that

$$\|P\| = \sup_{x\in S} \langle Px, x\rangle = \sup W(P). \tag{2.5}$$

Definition 2.12. *Let $A \subset \mathbb{C}$ be a convex non-empty set. A number $\alpha \in A$ is said to be an extreme point of A, when $\alpha = t\,u + (1-t)\,v$, with $u, v \in A$ and $0 < t < 1$ implies, $\alpha = u = v$.*

Lemma 2.13. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be an self-adjoint operator. Then, T satisfies $\mathcal{N}$ if, and only if $\|T\|$ or $-\|T\|$ is an extreme point of the numerical range $W(T)$.*

Proof. First, we consider the operator $P^{\pm} := \|T\|I \pm T$, which is positive. Hence for all $x \in S$, we get

$$\langle Tx, x\rangle \leq \langle Tx, x\rangle \pm \langle P^{\pm}x, x\rangle = \pm\|T\|. \tag{2.6}$$

If T satisfies $\mathcal{N}$, then by Proposition 2.4, we obtain that $\|T\|$ or $-\|T\|$ is an extreme point of the numerical range $W(T)$, since that

$$\langle Tx, x\rangle \leq \|T\|, \quad \langle Tx, x\rangle \geq -\|T\|, \quad \forall x \in S.$$

Now, if $\pm\|T\|$ is an extreme point of the numerical range $W(T)$, then there exists $x_0 \in S$, such that $\pm\|T\| = \langle Tx_0, x_0\rangle$. The equality in (2.6) implies that $\langle P^{\pm}x_0, x_0\rangle = 0$. Moreover, since the operator $P^{\pm}$ is positive, $P^{\pm}x_0 = 0$. Therefore, we conclude that $T\,x_0 = \pm\|T\|\,x_0$.

3. The $\mathcal{AN}$ operators

As already seen at the Section 1.1 any compact operator T in $\mathcal{L}(H, J)$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator. Indeed, if M is any closed subspace of H, then $T|_M$ is compact and therefore satisfies $\mathcal{N}$. Consequently, the algebra of compact operators carries $\mathcal{AN}$ out. Since an orthogonal projection is a partial isometry, it follows that any projection satisfies the properties $\mathcal{N}$. Although, it is not necessarily true that each projection is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator. In fact, let us study the following

Example 3.1. *Let X be the subspace of l^2, such the elements x have the form*

$$x = (x_1, x_2, x_2, x_3, x_4, x_4, x_5, \ldots)$$

and P is the projection on X, i.e., $P : l^2 \to l^2$,

$$P(x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots) = \Big(x_1, \frac{x_2 + x_3}{2}, \frac{x_2 + x_3}{2}, x_4, \frac{x_5 + x_6}{2}, \frac{x_5 + x_6}{2}, x_7, \ldots\Big).$$

Now, let M be a subspace of l^2, defined as

$$M := \{x \in l^2 : x = (x_1, x_1, x_2, x_2, x_2, x_3, x_3, x_3, x_4, x_4, x_4, \ldots)\}.$$

It follows that, $M \cap X = \{0\}$. Set $P|_M \equiv T : M \to l^2$, hence

$$T(x_1, x_1, x_2, x_2, x_2, \ldots) = \Big(x_1, \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}, \frac{x_1 + x_2}{2}, x_2, \frac{x_2 + x_3}{2}, \frac{x_2 + x_3}{2}, x_3, \ldots\Big).$$

For each $x \in M \cap S$, we compute the norm of Tx. First, we have

$$1 = \|x\|^2 = 2x_1^2 + 3\sum_{j=2}^{\infty} x_j^2. \tag{3.7}$$

Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|Tx\|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j^2 + 2\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \big(\frac{x_j + x_{j+1}}{2}\big)^2 \\ &= x_1^2 + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} x_j^2 + \frac{x_1^2}{2} + \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \frac{x_j^2}{2} + \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} x_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j\, x_{j+1} \qquad (3.8) \\ &= \frac{2}{3} + \frac{x_1^2}{6} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} x_j\, x_{j+1}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (3.7)*. Let* $\{s^n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ *be a sequence contained in* $M \cap S$*, i.e. for each* $n = 1, 2, \ldots$*,* $s^n \in M \cap S$*,*

$$s^n = (s_1^n, s_1^n, s_2^n, s_2^n, s_2^n, \ldots, s_n^n, s_n^n, s_n^n, \ldots), \quad \|s^n\| = 1,$$

s^n *defined as*

$$s_j^n = \begin{cases} \dfrac{1}{\sqrt{3(n-1)+2}} & j = 1, \ldots, n, \\ 0 & j > n. \end{cases} \tag{3.9}$$

We claim that, $\|Ts^n\| \to 1$ *as* $n \to \infty$*. Indeed, from* (3.8)

$$\|Ts^n\|^2 = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{(s_1^n)^2}{6} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} s_j^n \, s_{j+1}^n = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{6n-5}{6(3(n-1)+2)}.$$

Then, we obtain

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \|Ts^n\|^2 = \frac{2}{3} + \frac{6}{18} = 1.$$

Consequently, $\|T\| = \|P\| = 1$*.*

Now, let us show that T *does not satisfy* $\mathcal{N}$*. If there exists* $x \in S \cap M$*, such that* $1 = \|Tx\| = \|Px\|$*, then* 1 *is an eigenvalue of* P *associated to the vector* x*. Consequently,* $Px = x$*, which is a contradiction, since we have assumed* $M \cap P(l^2) = \{0\}$ *and we have* $\|x\| = 1$*.*

Therefore, we have proved the following result.

Lemma 3.2. *Let* P *be an orthogonal projection. Then* P *does not necessarily satisfy* $\mathcal{AN}$ *property.*

The next proposition will be used as a proof of the next theorem, but it is important by itself.

Proposition 3.3. *Let* R *be an isometry on* H *and* $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ *an* $\mathcal{AN}$ *operator. Then,* TR *and* RT *satisfy the property* $\mathcal{AN}$*.*

Proof. Let M be a subspace of H. First, clearly the composition RT satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. Indeed, if $x_0 \in M \cap S$ is such that, $\|T\| = \|Tx_0\|$, then

$$\|RT\| = \|T\| = \|Tx_0\| = \|RTx_0\|.$$

Now, let us show that TR also satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. Since M is a closed subspace of H and R an isometry, hence $R(M)$ is also a closed subspace of H. Moreover, we have

$$\|T\,R|_M\| = \|T|_{R(M)}\|.$$

Since $R(M)$ is closed and T satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, there exists $Rz \in R(M)$, with $\|Rz\| = \|z\| = 1$, such that $\|T\,R|_M\| = \|T(Rz)\|$.

Subsequently, we recall a well known definition for equivalent operators.

Definition 3.4. *The operators $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ and $S \in \mathcal{L}(J)$ are called unitary equivalents, when there exists a unitary operator U on $\mathcal{L}(J, H)$, such that*

$$U^* T U = S.$$

In fact, if T and S are unitary equivalents, then there is no criterion based only on the geometry of the Hilbert space, in such a way that, T could be distinguished from S. Therefore, since T and S are abstractly the same operator, it is natural to conjecture that some characteristic endowed by T must be satisfied by S, and vice-versa.

Theorem 3.5. *Let T, S be two unitary equivalent operators. Then, T is $\mathcal{AN}$ operator if, and only if S is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.*

Proof. Assume that U is a unitary operator such that $U^\star T U = S$, hence $TU = US$. Since U is an isometry, by Proposition 3.3 if T satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, then TU satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. Moreover, it follows that, US also satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. Once more, conforming to Proposition 3.3, we have that S satisfies property $\mathcal{AN}$.

Remark 3.6. *Given $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$, we recall that P_T was defined as the positive square root of T^*T. Therefore, T satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ if, and only if P_T satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, see* (2.3). *Consequently, it is enough to establish the condition $\mathcal{AN}$ for positive operators.*

Proposition 3.7. *An operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ satisfies the property $\mathcal{AN}$ if, and only if, for all orthogonal projection $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$, TQ satisfies $\mathcal{N}$.*

Proof. Let M be a closed subspace of H and Q an orthogonal projection on M. Then, we have $\|TQ\| = \|T|_M\|$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let $R \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be an operator of finite rank. Then $I + R$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.*

Proof. Suppose that $\dim R(H) = n$. Since R is finite rank, we could write

$$Rx = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j \langle x, e_j \rangle\, e_j,$$

where $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is an orthonormal set of H and $\lambda_j \geq 0$, $(j = 1, 2, \ldots n)$. Let M_n be the subspace generated by $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$, thus $H = M_n \oplus M_n^\perp$. Moreover, for any $x \in H$, $x = x_1 + x_2$, such that

$$x_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle x, e_j \rangle\, e_j \quad \text{and} \quad x_2 = \sum_{\alpha \in A} \langle x, e_\alpha \rangle\, e_\alpha,$$

where $\{e_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in A}$ is an orthonormal basis of $M_n^\perp$, $\langle e_\alpha, e_j\rangle = 0$, for all $j = 1,\dots,n$, $\alpha \in A$ and $\langle e_\alpha, e_\beta\rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ for each $\alpha,\beta \in A$. Now, define $T := I + R$, then for each $x \in H$,

$$Tx = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \langle x, e_j\rangle\, e_j + \sum_{\alpha\in A} \langle x, e_\alpha\rangle\, e_\alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j \langle x, e_j\rangle\, e_j.$$

Consequently, for each $x \in S$,

$$\|Tx\|^2 = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \big(\lambda_j^2 + 2\,\lambda_j\big)|\langle x, e_j\rangle|^2.$$

Therefore, if P is the finite range projection on M_n, then $\|TPx\| = \|Tx\|$, for any $x \in S$, and as TP has finite range and therefore satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, then T satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let H be a separable Hilbert space. If $P, Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ are two orthogonal projections such that, the dimension of their ranks and null spaces are infinite, then P and Q are unitary equivalent.*

Proof. Since the rank and the null space of a projection are subspaces, there exist unitary operators $U_1 : P(H) \to Q(H)$ and $U_2 : \mathcal{N}(P) \to \mathcal{N}(Q)$. Now, we define $U : H \to H$, such that

$$U|_{P(H)} = U_1 \quad \text{and} \quad U|_{\mathcal{N}(P)} = U_2.$$

Hence it is clear that U as defined above is a unitary operator. Moreover, if $x \in H$, then $x = x_1 + x_2$ where $x_1 \in P(H)$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{N}(P)$. From the definition of U_1 and U_2, we have $QUx = Ux_1 = UPx$. Therefore, P and Q are unitary equivalents.

Theorem 3.10. *Let $Q \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be an orthogonal projection. Then, Q satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ property if, and only if the dimension of the null space or the dimension of the rank of Q is finite.*

Proof. If $\dim Q(H) < \infty$, then Q is compact, hence it satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. Now, assume $\dim \mathcal{N}(Q) < \infty$. Then, we have $Q = I - P$, where P is a projection with finite rank. Therefore, Q satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$.

On the other hand, if $\dim Q(H) = \dim \mathcal{N}(Q) = \infty$, we consider two cases:

i) H separable. In this case, by Lemma 3.9, we have that Q is unitary equivalent to the orthogonal projection of Example 3.1, which does no satisfy $\mathcal{AN}$ condition. Consequently, by Theorem 3.5 Q does not satisfy $\mathcal{AN}$ either.

ii) H is not separable. If $Q(H)$ is countable, we take H_1 be a separable Hilbert space such that $Q(H) \subset H_1$ and $\dim(Q(H)^\perp \cap H_1) = \infty$. Thus, we have that $Q|_{H_1}$ is an orthogonal projection, $Q|_{H_1} \in \mathcal{L}(H_1)$ and by the separable case (i), $Q|_{H_1}$ does not satisfy $\mathcal{AN}$. Therefore, we have that Q does not satisfy $\mathcal{AN}$ either.

Now, if $Q(H)$ is not countable, let $H_1 \subset Q(H)$ be a countable subspace and Q_1 be an orthogonal projection on H_1. Furthermore, let N_1 be an infinite countable subset of $Q(H)^\perp$, then $H_2 = H_1 \oplus N_1$ is a separable Hilbert space. Conforming with the separable case (i), it follows that $Q_1|_{H_2} \in \mathcal{L}(H_2)$ is an orthogonal projection in H_2 which does not satisfy $\mathcal{AN}$, since $\|Qx\| = \|Q_1 x\|$ for all $x \in H_2$. Consequently, neither Q satisfy $\mathcal{AN}$.

Definition 3.11. *Let $B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$. The operator B is called a co-isometry, when B^* is an isometry.*

As stated in Remark 2.2, it follows that:

Remark 3.12. *One observer that, a co-isometry V is a partial isometry with initial domain $V^*(H)$. Thus, if V^* is not a unitary operator, then $\mathcal{N}(V) \neq \{0\}$.*

Now, we observe that if $B \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a co-isometry, then

$$BB^* = I, \qquad \mathcal{N}(B^*B) = \mathcal{N}(B).$$

Furthermore, we have the following characterization for the $\mathcal{AN}$ property.

Proposition 3.13. *Let B be a co-isometry. Then, B satisfies the property $\mathcal{AN}$ if, and only if $\mathcal{N}(B)$ has finite dimension.*

Proof. Since B^* is an isometry, by Proposition 3.3 B satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ condition if, and only if B^*B satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. Now, we observe that B^*B is an orthogonal projection, hence by Theorem 3.10, it follows that B carries $\mathcal{AN}$ out if, and only if $\dim \mathcal{N}(B^*B) < \infty$ or $\dim B^*B(H) < \infty$. Additionally, we have

$$B^*B(H) = \mathcal{N}(B^*B)^\perp = \mathcal{N}(B)^\perp = B^*(H).$$

Consequently, B satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ if, and only if $\dim \mathcal{N}(B) < \infty$ or $\dim B^*(H) < \infty$. Likewise, since B^* is an injective operator, if $B^*(H)$ has finite dimension, then $\mathcal{N}(B)$ also has finite dimension.

Contrarily to Proposition 2.6, and according to the proposition quoted above, it follows that:

Remark 3.14. *Even if V is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator, it does not follow necessarily that V^* carries $\mathcal{AN}$ out.*

Proposition 3.15. *Let $U \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a partial isometry with initial domain M. Then, U satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ if, and only if, the dimension of M or the dimension of $M^\perp$ is finite.*

Proof. For all $x \in H$, we have $\|U^*Ux\| = \|Ux\|$. Therefore, U satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ if, and only if $U^*U = P_M$ satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. We can prove it applying Theorem 3.10.

Remark 3.16. *Let $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a positive operator. Then, P is a partial isometry with initial domain M if, and only if P is an orthogonal projection on M. Indeed, assume that P is a partial isometry with initial domain M. Hence $\|P\| = 1$ and for each $x \in M$, $\|Px\| = \|x\|$. Since P is a positive operator, it follows that*

$$\forall x \in H, \quad \|P\|^2 \leq \|P\| \, \langle Px, x\rangle.$$

Moreover, we have for all $x \in S$, $\langle Px, x\rangle \leq \|P\| = 1$. Consequently, for each $x \in M \cap S$, $\langle Px, x\rangle = 1$.

Now, let P be an orthogonal projection on M and set $T := I - P$. Then, for each $x \in S \cap M$, we have $\langle Tx, x\rangle = 0$. Since T is a positive operator, we have for all $x \in M$, $Tx = 0$. Therefore, $T|_M = 0$, i.e. $P|_M = I$.

3.1. More characterization

Proposition 3.17. *Let $V, R \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ be respectively an isometry and a finite rank operator. Then $V + R$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.*

Proof. As $V^*V = I$, then $V + R = V + RV^*V = (I + RV^*)V$. Since that RV^* is an operator of finite rank, by Proposition 3.3 and Lemma 3.8, we conclude that $V + R$ satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$.

Proposition 3.18. *Let $V, P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be respectively a co-isometry and an orthogonal projection, which are $\mathcal{AN}$ operators. If $R \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an operator of finite rank, then $V + R$ and $P + R$, carry $\mathcal{AN}$ out.*

Proof. Since V is a co-isometry, similarly as above, we have $V^*V = I$, thus $V + R = V(V^*R + I)$. Therefore, as V^*R is an operator of finite rank, by Proposition 3.3 and Lemma 3.8, we conclude that $V + R$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.

Now, if P satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, then P has finite rank, or we could write $P = I - K$, where K is a projection with finite rank. Consequently, by Lemma 3.8 $P + R$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.

Proposition 3.19. *Let $W \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ be a partial isometry with initial domain M, which satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ and $R \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ an operator of finite rank. Then, $W + R$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.*

Proof. 1. First, since W carries $\mathcal{AN}$ out, hence, conforming to Proposition 3.15, we have $\dim M < \infty$ or $\dim M^\perp < \infty$. We assume that $\dim M < \infty$, then W is compact and, consequently $W + R$ satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ condition.

2. Now, we assume that $\dim M^\perp < \infty$. Set $n := \dim R(H)$, thus for any $x \in H$, we could write

$$Rx = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j \, \langle x, e_j\rangle \, \epsilon_j,$$

where $\lambda_j > 0$, $(j = 1, \ldots, n)$ and $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^n$, $\{\epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^n$ are orthonormal sets in H and J respectively. Let $m = \dim M^\perp$ and $\{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^m$ be an orthonormal basis for

$M^{\perp}$. Moreover, for any $x \in H$, it follows that $\|Wx\|^2 = \|x\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\langle x, \varphi_j\rangle|^2$. Then, for any $x \in S$

$$\begin{aligned}\|(W+R)x\|^2 &= \langle Wx + Rx, Wx + Rx\rangle \\ &= \|Wx\|^2 + \langle Wx, Rx\rangle + \langle Rx, Wx\rangle + \|Rx\|^2 \\ &= 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\langle x, \varphi_j\rangle|^2 + 2\,\mathcal{R}e \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j \overline{\langle x, e_j\rangle}\, \langle x, W^* \epsilon_j\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j^2 |\langle x, e_j\rangle|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Now, let N be the subspace generated by

$$\{e_j, W^*\epsilon_j, \varphi_k\}, \quad (j = 1, \ldots, n,\ k = 1, \ldots, m),$$

and Q the orthogonal projection on N. Hence, it follows that, for all $x \in S$,

$$\|(W+R)Qx\| = \|(W+R)x\|.$$

Therefore, as $(W+R)Q$ satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, we conclude that $W+R$ carry $\mathcal{AN}$ out.

Proposition 3.20. *Let $P_1, P_2 \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be $\mathcal{AN}$ orthogonal projections. Then $P_1 \pm P_2$, P_1P_2 and P_2P_1 satisfy the $\mathcal{AN}$ property.*

Proof. In fact, the proof follows with the following remark. If P is an orthogonal projection, which satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, then P or $I - P$ has finite rank. Therefore, if P satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ or P has finite rank, or we could write $P = I - K$, where K is a projection with finite rank.

Theorem 3.21. *Let M be a subspace of H and $T \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$, such that*

$$\|T|_M\| < \|T\|.$$

Then, there exists an element $x \in S$, satisfying $\|Tx\| = \|T|_M\|$.

Proof. 1. Since $\|T|_M\| < \|T\|$, given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $w \in S$, such that $\|T|_M\| < \|Tw\| + \epsilon$. Consequently, we have

$$\|T|_M\|^2 \le \|Tw\|^2 = \langle T^*Tw, w\rangle.$$

Moreover, for some $y \in S$, $\|Ty\| \le \|T|_M\|$. Hence we have

$$\langle T^*Ty, y\rangle \le \|T|_M\|^2 \le \langle T^*Tw, w\rangle.$$

2. Now, by the convexity of the numerical rank of the positive operator T^*T, i.e. $W(T^*T)$, there exists an element $x \in S$, satisfying $\langle T^\star Tx, x\rangle = \|T|_M\|^2$. Consequently, we obtain $\|Tx\| = \|T|_M\|$.

Corollary 3.22. *Let $P \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a positive operator and M a subspace of H, such that $\|P|_M\| < \|P\|$. Then, there exists an element $x \in S$, satisfying*

$$\langle Px, x\rangle = \|P|_M\|.$$

Proposition 3.23. *Let $K \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a positive compact operator. Then, $K+I$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.*

Proof. Since K is compact and positive, it is also $K^2 + 2\,K$. Hence there exists $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ a compact and positive operator, such that $T^2 = K^2 + 2\,K$. Now, let M be a subspace of H. Then, there exists $x \in S \cap M =: S_M$, such that $\|Tx\|^2 = \|T|_M\|^2$, that is

$$\langle (K^2 + 2\,K)x, x\rangle = \sup_{z \in S_M} \|Tz\|^2 = \sup_{z\in S_M} \langle (K^2 + 2\,K)z, z\rangle.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\|(K+I)|_M\|^2 = \sup_{z\in S_M} \|(K+I)z\|^2 = 1 + \langle (K^2 + 2\,K)x, x\rangle = \|(K+I)x\|^2.$$

On the other hand, we already know that some type of operator satisfying $\mathcal{AN}$, such a sum with an operator of finite rank already satisfy $\mathcal{AN}$. For instance, if $K \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a positive compact operator, then $K + I$ satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$. Therefore, observing the examples at the beginning of this section, it is natural to ask, if $K + I + R$ satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ condition, when $R \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is an operator of finite rank. In fact, this question was positively answered.

Theorem 3.24. *Let $K \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a positive compact operator and $R \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ an operator of finite rank. Then, $K + I + R$ satisfies the $\mathcal{AN}$ condition.*

Proof. Initially, we will prove that $K + I + R$ satisfies the $\mathcal{N}$ condition.

1. If K has finite rank, then from Lemma 3.8, $K+I+R$ satisfies $\mathcal{N}$ condition.

2. Now, assume that K does not have finite rank and set $T := I + K + R$. Furthermore, we can suppose T positive and R self-adjoint, since T satisfies $\mathcal{N}$ if, and only if T^*T does. Indeed, we have $T^*T = I + \mathsf{K} + \mathsf{R}$, where $\mathsf{K} = \big(K^* + K + K^*K\big)$ is a positive compact operator, and

$$\mathsf{R} = \big(R + R^* + R^*R + K^*R + R^*K\big)$$

is a self-adjoin finite rank operator. Therefore, we have for each $x \in H$,

$$(K+R)x = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \, \langle x, e_j\rangle \, e_j, \tag{3.10}$$

where $\{e_j\}$ is a orthonormal sequence, $|\lambda_j| \searrow 0$ and $\lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $j \geq 1$. Consequently, for each $x \in H$,

$$\langle (K+R)x, x\rangle = \sum_{j\geq 1} \lambda_j \, |\langle x, e_j\rangle|^2.$$

3. We claim that, there exists a k, such that $\lambda_k > 0$. Otherwise $0 \leq K \leq -R$, but since R has finite rank and K is positive, it follows that K has finite rank. Indeed, let $n = \dim R(H)$. If $x \in R(H)^\perp$, then $0 \leq \langle Kx, x\rangle \leq -\langle Rx, x\rangle = 0$,

therefore $\langle Kx, x\rangle = 0$ and since that $K \geq 0$, we have $Kx = 0$ for all $x \in R(H)^{\perp}$. Moreover, if $Rx = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \gamma_j \langle x, \eta_j\rangle \eta_j$, then $K(H)$ is contained in the subspace generated by $\{K(\eta_1), K(\eta_2), \ldots, K(\eta_n)\}$, which is a contradiction.

4. Let E be the subspace generated by $\{e_j\}$, thus $H = E \oplus E^{\perp}$. Consequently, for each $x \in H$, we have

$$Tx = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j + 1) \langle x, e_j\rangle e_j + Px, \tag{3.11}$$

where P is an orthogonal projection on $E^{\perp}$. Now, since T is positive $\langle Te_j, e_j\rangle = (\lambda_j + 1) \geq 0$, for all $j \geq 1$. From (3.11), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\|Tx\|^2 =& \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j + 1)^2 \, |\langle x, e_j\rangle|^2 + \|Px\|^2 \\ \leq& \sup_j \{(\lambda_j + 1)^2\} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} |\langle x, e_j\rangle|^2 + \|Px\|^2 = \sup_j \{(\lambda_j + 1)^2\} \, \|x\|^2,\end{aligned}$$

where we have used that, $\sup_j \{\lambda_j + 1\}^2 \geq (\lambda_k + 1)^2 > 1$. Then, we obtain

$$\|T\| = \sup_j \{\lambda_j + 1\}.$$

Now as $|\lambda_1| \geq \ldots \geq |\lambda_{k-1}| \geq \lambda_k \geq |\lambda_{k+1}| \geq \ldots$, there exists an indices $i \leq k$, such that $\|T\| = \lambda_i + 1 = \|Te_i\|$, which proves that $K + I + R$ satisfies the $\mathcal{N}$ condition.

Finally, let M be a subspace of H, and define

$$T_1 := T|_M, \quad I_1 := I|_M, \quad K_1 := K|_M \quad \text{and} \quad R_1 := R|_M.$$

Then, $T_1 = I_1 + K_1 + R_1$. Since T_1 satisfies the $\mathcal{N}$ condition if, and only if $T_1^* T_1$ satisfies the $\mathcal{N}$ condition, similarly as displayed above, we can suppose that $T_1 \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ is a positive operator, $K_1 \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ is a positive compact operator and $R_1 \in \mathcal{L}(M)$ is a self-adjoint finite rank operator. Therefore, we can procedure as the initial part and obtain that T_1 satisfies the $\mathcal{N}$ condition.

3.2. Structure of $\mathcal{AN}$ operators

In this section, we analyze the structure of the positive operators satisfying the $\mathcal{AN}$ condition.

Example 3.25. *Let H be a separable Hilbert space and $\{e_j\}$ a hilbertian basis of it. Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be defined as $Tx := \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \langle x, e_j\rangle e_j$, where $\lambda_j \searrow \lambda$. Then, T is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator. Indeed, set $V := T - \lambda I$, therefore*

$$Vx = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j - \lambda) \langle x, e_j\rangle e_j.$$

Since $\lambda_j \searrow \lambda$, V is compact and positive, hence $T = \lambda I + V$ is an $\mathcal{AN}$ operator.

Now let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be defined as

$$Tx = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \lambda_j \langle x, \upsilon_j \rangle \upsilon_j, \tag{3.12}$$

where $\{\upsilon_j\}$ is an orthonormal set in H (not necessarily a basis) and $\lambda_j \searrow \lambda > 0$. If $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$, then T satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ condition. Indeed, we write $T = K + \lambda P$, where for any $x \in H$

$$Kx = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lambda_j - \lambda) \langle x, \upsilon_j \rangle \upsilon_j, \qquad Px = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle x, \upsilon_j \rangle \upsilon_j.$$

Therefore, K and P are respectively a compact operator and an orthogonal projection on $K(H)$ $(= T(H))$. Now, since $\dim \mathcal{N}(T) < \infty$, hence we have $P = I - R$, where R is an orthogonal projection of finite range on $\mathcal{N}(T)$. Thus

$$T = \lambda \Big(\frac{1}{\lambda} K + I - R \Big)$$

satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$ by Proposition 3.24.

Definition 3.26. *Let $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{L}(H, J)$ be two operators, we say that T_1 and T_2 are mutually orthogonal, denoted $T_1 \perp T_2$, if for any $x, y \in H$, $\langle T_1 x, T_2 y \rangle = 0$. Moreover, when $T_1 \perp T_2$ we write the sum of T_1, T_2 as $T_1 \oplus T_2$.*

Theorem 3.27. *Let $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ be a positive operator, which satisfies the $\mathcal{AN}$ condition . Then T has the following representation*

$$T = \sum_{n \geq 1} \beta_n \, \upsilon_n \otimes \upsilon_n \oplus R_1,$$

where $\{\upsilon_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is an orthonormal sequence of vectors in H, $\beta_n \searrow \beta \geq 0$ and $\beta \geq \|R_1\|$.

Proof. It is enough to show the representation. First, since $T \in \mathcal{L}(H)$ is a positive $\mathcal{AN}$ operator, there exists an element $\upsilon_1 \in S$, such that $T\upsilon_1 = \|T\| \upsilon_1$. Let H_1 be the one-dimensional subspace of H generated by $\{\upsilon_1\}$, i.e. $H_1 = \mathbb{C}\, \upsilon_1$, and $K_1 := \upsilon_1^{\perp}$. Thus $H = H_1 \oplus K_1$, that is, for each $x \in H$, we write $x = x_1 + y_1$. Moreover, by Remark 2.8, we have $T(\upsilon_1^{\perp}) \subset \upsilon_1^{\perp}$, and setting $\beta_1 := \|T\|$, we could write

$$Tx = \beta_1 \langle x, \upsilon_1 \rangle \, \upsilon_1 + Ty_1 = \beta_1 \, (\upsilon_1 \otimes \upsilon_1) \, x + Ty_1.$$

Therefore, denoting $Ty_1 = T_1 x$, it follows that $T = \beta_1 \, (\upsilon_1 \otimes \upsilon_1) + T_1$, where T_1 has the following representation,

$$T_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & T^1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and T^1 is the restriction of T to the subspace K_1, i.e. $T^1 = T|_{K_1}$. Now, since T^1 is positive and satisfies $\mathcal{N}$, hence there exists $\upsilon_2 \in (S \cap K_1)$, such that $T^1 \upsilon_2 = \beta_2\, \upsilon_2$, where $\beta_2 = \|T^1\| \leq \beta_1$. It is clear that, $\upsilon_1 \perp \upsilon_2$, i.e they are orthogonal. Analogously, we set $H_2 = \mathbb{C}\, \upsilon_2$, that is the subspace of H_1 generated by $\{\upsilon_2\}$, and $K_2 = \upsilon_2^{\perp}$. Then, T could be written as

$$T = \beta_1\, \upsilon_1 \otimes \upsilon_1 + \beta_2\, \upsilon_2 \otimes \upsilon_2 + T_2,$$

with T_2 given by

$$T_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where T^2 is the restriction of T^1 to the subspace K_2, i.e. $T^2 = T^1|_{K_2}$. Thus, continuing in this way, the operator T, which satisfies $\mathcal{AN}$, could be written as

$$T = \sum_{n \geq 1} \beta_n\, \upsilon_n \otimes \upsilon_n + R_1, \tag{3.13}$$

where $\{\upsilon_n\}$ is an orthonormal sequence of vectors in H, $\{\beta_n\}$ is a decreasing sequence of positive real numbers, such that, for all $j \geq 1$ $T\upsilon_j = \beta_j\, \upsilon_j$, and R_1 is a remainder operator, satisfying $\|R_1\| \leq \beta_j$, $(j \geq 1)$.

If $R_1 = 0$, then the operator T has the simplest diagonal form. For instance, it happens when $\dim T(H) < \infty$ or T is compact.

References

References

[1] Chevreau, B., Personal communications.

[2] Chalendar, I., Techniques d'algbres duales et sous-espaces invariants. (French) [Dual algebra techniques and invariant subspaces] With a preface in Romanian by Bernard Chevreau. Monografii Matematice (Timisoara) [Mathematical Monographs (Timisoara)], 55. Universitatea de Vest din Timisoara, Facultatea de Matematica, Timisoara, 1995. iv+94 pp.

[3] Fabian, M., Habala, P., Hjek, P., Santaluca, V.M., Pelant, J., Zizler, V., Functional Analysis and Infinite-Dimensional Geometry, Canadian Mathematical Society, 2001.

[4] Halmos P.R., Introduction to Hilbert space and the theory of spectral multiplicity, Chelsea, New York, (1951).

[5] Hellinger, E., Die Orthogonalinvarianten quadratischer Formen, Inaugural-Dissertation, Göttingen, 1907.

[6] Rudin, W., Functional Analysis, McGraw-Hill, Inc., second edition, 1991.